

Signatory Agency Committee (SAC) Agreement

2004 Monitoring and Evaluation Report

January 2005

Why was this report prepared?

The Signatory Agency Committee (SAC) Agreement Monitoring and Evaluation Report is prepared each year to examine how the SAC process (described below) is working and if the intended goals are being achieved. This report reviews SAC activity the period of October 2003 to September 2004.

What is the “SAC” Agreement?

- The purpose of the Agreement is to integrate aquatic resource permits requirements into the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process to improve and streamline transportation project delivery and provide increased environmental protection.
- The SAC Agreement currently applies to transportation projects requiring a NEPA Environmental Impact Statement and individual Corps of Engineers Section 10 or 404 permit.
- The original 1996 NEPA/404 Merger Agreement was formally revised in September 2002 to incorporate several process improvements developed collaboratively by the state and federal SAC Signatory Agencies.

Which projects were evaluated in the 2004 report?

- The Edmonds Crossing (ferry terminal) Project
- The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
- The SR 167 Puyallup to Fife Project
- The Coleman Ferry Dock Project.

A complete list of active SAC projects and those that have recently completed the SAC process is posted on this web site.

What do the Performance Measures show?

A detailed evaluation of the above-mentioned transportation projects participating in the SAC process was conducted. 19 individual agency Concurrence responses were reviewed applying specific performance measures adopted by the SAC agencies. The performance measures showed:

1. Projects submitted the optional Pre-Concurrence package **50%** of the time.

2. Early Warning Packets were submitted **100%** of the time
3. Nearly **70%** of all project Concurrence requests (**13 requests**) were approved or waived. Two projects received **100%** Concurrence.
4. **30%** of the Concurrence requests (**6 requests**) were denied invoking Issue Resolution.
5. **80%** of the Concurrence request responses were received within the 45-day SAC review period goal.
6. **20%** of the Concurrence responses were late by a median of 3 *days*.
7. Transportation projects responded to agency Concurrence Advisory Comments **100%** of the time.
8. The Issue Resolution process could not be initiated with the prescribed 17-day window for the one project entering this process due to extremely busy agency staff schedules.

Are their additional SAC “Process” improvements?

Yes. SAC agency representatives have worked diligently during the reporting period to develop and achieve consensus on the following SAC process improvements.

Completed

Update Aquatic Mitigation Guidance
Conducted 2 SAC training meetings

In-Progress

Goals, Objectives, and Screening
Involving Non-SAC agencies
Inviting Non-EIS projects to SAC

Who are the SAC agency representatives?

SAC Agency Representative	Agency Representing
Patty Betts	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Nancy Brennan–Dubbs	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Richard Clark	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Krista Rave-Perkins	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Teresa Eturaspe	Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Neil Rickard	NOAA Fisheries
Phil KauzLoric	Washington Department of Transportation
Sharon Love	Federal Highway Administration
Kate Stenberg	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Terry Swanson	Washington Department of Ecology

For additional information

Please contact Phil KauzLoric, Washington Department of Transportation, at (360) 705-7486 or via e-mail at kauzlop@wsdot.wa.gov.